

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,675	11/25/2003	Dennis J. O'Rear	005950-740	6247
21839 7	590 02/23/2005	EXAMINER		
	NE SWECKER & N	PARSA, JAFAR F		
POST OFFICE				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Annii antian Na	Ammlinom4(n)			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/720,675	O'REAR ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jafar Parsa	1621			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REAMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by start reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS frutte, cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11	1/25/2003.				
2a) <u></u>		his action is non-final.				
3)□						
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)[Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-23 is/are withdom Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) \square a	ccepted or b) objected to by th	e Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	= * *	` '			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn The oath or declaration is objected to by the	• '	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)[_ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applic riority documents have been rece eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa	ary (PTO-413)			
3) 🔯 Infori	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/1/2004</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date Il Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-18, drawn to a process for the conversion of syngas, classified in class 518, subclass 700.
- Claims 19-23, drawn to a gas to liquid facility, classified in class 422, subclass various.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced with a gas to liquid facility as disclosed in US patent No. 6,512,018.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Ms. Hayworth on 2/8/2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-18.

Art Unit: 1621

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 19-23 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37

CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy (USPN 6,512,018 B2) in view of Clark et al (USPN 6,156,809).

Art Unit: 1621

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a process for the conversion of syngas using multiple Fischer-Tropsch reactors comprises reacting at least a portion of a first syngas in a first Fischer-Tropsch reactor to form a first hydrocarbonaceous product and a second syngas. The second syngas is mixed with a H2-containing stream to form an adjusted syngas. At least a portion of the adjusted syngas is reacted in a second Fischer-Tropsch reactor to form a second hydrocarbonaceous product and a third syngas. At least a portion of the first and second hydrocarbonaceous products are blended to obtain a blended hydrocarbonaceous product.

Kennedy teaches a Fischer-Tropsch-based process and system for converting light hydrocarbons into heavier hydrocarbons uses a plurality of different synthesis gas generators. The process includes preparing a first synthesis gas having a H₂:CO ratio greater than 2:1; removing a portion of the hydrogen from the first synthesis gas; preparing a second synthesis gas with a CO.sub.2 recycle wherein the second synthesis gas has a H.sub.2 :CO ratio less than 2:1; adding the removed hydrogen to the second synthesis gas to increase the H.sub.2 :CO ratio of the second synthesis gas; and using a Fischer-Tropsch reaction to convert the first synthesis gas and the second synthesis gas to heavier hydrocarbons (see abstract). Kennedy teaches that the first hydrocarbon synthesis reactor produces a first tail gas (unreacted carbon oxides, hydrogen and light hydrocarbons), which the third synthesis gas is generated from the first tail gas for recycling to the first synthesis gas unit. The second hydrocarbon synthesis reactor produces a second tail gas, which is delivered to a carbon dioxide removal unit to remove all or portion of carbon dioxide the removed carbon dioxide is

Art Unit: 1621

delivered to the second synthesis gas subsystem 16 (see col. 3, lines 32-35 and col. 5, lines 15-21). Kennedy does not expressly disclose the ratio of hydrogen to carbon oxides. However, since Kennedy's first and second synthesis gas are produced in the same manner as described in the instant claimed invention one would have expected that Kennedy's process also have the same range of hydrogen to carbon oxides ratio, and also first and the second synthesis gas streams contain at least the same or more than 2 volume % carbon dioxide. In addition, the carbon dioxide conversion in Kennedy's process is well within the carbon dioxide conversion range disclosed in the instant claimed invention.

Kennedy discloses that numerous catalysts have been used in carrying out the Fischer-Tropsch reaction. Usually a Group VIII metal, such as cobalt, iron, or ruthenium, is used. Both saturated and unsaturated hydrocarbons can be produced. The Fischer-Tropsch (F-T) hydrocarbon synthesis reaction carried out at low or medium pressure (i.e. in the range of about atmospheric to 500 psig). See col. 1, lines 40-45 and col. 2, lines 23-27.

Kennedy does not teach blending at least a portion of first and second hydrocarbonaceous products to obtain a blended hydrocarbonaceous product and upgrading the hydrocarbonaceous products into at least one product selected from the group consisting of jet fuel, diesel fuel, lubricant base oil, naphtha and combinations thereof. However, Clark teaches using a multiple Fischer-Tropsch reactor in series, operating at temperature from about 210 to 280 C and pressure of 110 Kpa to about 3500 Kpa for conversion of syngas to hydrocarbonaceous products, wherein the

Application/Control Number: 10/720,675

Art Unit: 1621

hydrocarbonaceous product could be sold individually or could be combined and sold as a single product and alternatively the crude products can be upgraded into more valuable products such as, jet fuel (see col. 11, line 64 through col. 12, line 7 and col. 13 lines 37-60. It would therefore have been prima facie obvious to blend the hydrocarbonaceous product and upgrade the blended hydrocarbonaceous product to more valuable products such as, jet fuel as taught by Kennedy et al.

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jafar Parsa whose telephone number is (571)272-0643. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m.-4:30 p.m. (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571)272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jafar Parsa Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1621

JP

J. PARSA PRIMARY EXAMINER

AU! 1621